

2

A
SPECIMEN
OF THE
CANDOUR and VERACITY
MANIFESTED IN THE
CONFESSIO^NAL.

6



A
SPECIMEN
OF THE
CANDOUR and VERACITY

MANIFESTED IN THE
CONFESSIONAL;
WITH RESPECT TO A

DISPUTED CLAUSE in the 20th ARTICLE.

IN A
LETTER to a FRIEND.

OCTOBER 12th, 1774.

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by W. STUART, No. 67,

PATER-NOSTER-ROW,

MDCCLXXVII.



P R E F A C E.

PERHAPS it may not be amiss to acquaint the reader, before he enters upon the following pages, with the reasons which induced the writer to give a Specimen of the *Candour* and *Veracity* of the author of the *Confessional*, merely as exhibited in his treating upon the contested clause of the 20th Article of our Church. This particular was not selected as being the *only* or *most* faulty part of that celebrated book; but it was owing chiefly to an ac-

A 3 cident,

P R E F A C E.

cident, which brought *Strype's* life of *Archbishop Parker*, into the writer's hands, where he found the clause in question defended with much force of reason and evidence of fact. This led to an examination of other books on the subject, and the result of the enquiry was the following letter to a particular friend. It was not then intended for publick view, but merely for his entertainment, and to let him see (and such others as it might be communicated to) how worthy the author of the confessional is of the confidence of his readers, and the encomiums bestowed upon him by his admirers; and that it is very possible, after all his *plausibility*, that in other instances he is only either
reviving

P R E F A C E.

reviving calumny that has been long refuted, abusing the credulity of his readers by mere sophistry, or gratifying, at the expence of every thing candid, the enemies of that church of which he has proved himself a very unworthy and disingenuous member. These friends thinking, that if this specimen were made publick, it might be of some service to the cause of truth, the writer was not unwilling to commit it to the press. And having declared, that it is chiefly indebted to *chance* for its being, its late appearance in the controversy, will not need to be further explained. However, tho' this silly tale of the forgery of the contested clause has of old been satisfactorily refuted,

P R E F A C E.

again and again, and particularly of late by a learned and pious divine of our Church,* yet the writer fancies he has placed the subject in a point of view, which will still add to the force of their reasoning, and more evidently display the many disingenuous *arts* practised by this *restless* and *prejudiced* writer.

—Reader! tho' I love *genuine* candour, I use these terms, and others of the kind, without scruple, and after the most serious deliberation; not doubting in the end to be found only to have given *things* their proper *names*. For though in some cases it may be fit to distinguish between *men* and their

* Dr. Ridley, in his *Three Letters to the author of the Confessional*.

P R E F A C E.

their *opinions*, and only make the *latter* the subject of our scrutiny and reprehension, yet there must be cases in which the *man* may deserve examination as much as his *opinions*; and, if ever there was an instance of this kind in a writer of controversy, the author of the Confessional is certainly one. I own my design from the first was, in part, to attack him personally, and to lay such things to his charge as ought to discredit him forever as a *writer* and *reformer* with all who have any love for *humanity*, *truth*, *candour*, *plain-dealing* and *decency*. Whether I have not produced sufficient proofs, facts and arguments for this purpose, in the course of the following pages, is submitted to the judgment of the reader.—But
if

P R E F A C E.

if I should even fail in making good what I lay to the charge of this author, surely neither he, nor any of his warmest friends can reasonably quarrel with a few strokes of a style of writing in which he so conspicuously shines, and for the substance of which he has ransacked, with uncommon labour, not only those books of the Dissenters that have figured most as enemies to the Church of England, but has even thought it no shame to call in the assistance of the *Deist Collins*.

MY

MY DEAR FRIEND.

I Have been lately looking a little into that singular performance the *Confessional*. Before I had gone over many leaves, I apprehended it to be the work of some restless Dissenter; as it contains scarce a page in which there is not some keen sarcasm on such Church of England Divines, as have at any time wrote in defence of its doctrine or discipline. It contains also as frequent encomiums

ums on all those, whether Dissenters or Churchmen, who have laboured to bring the church of England into contempt; and I was confirmed in my opinion of the merits of this performance, on finding it so highly careffed by the Dissenters, and their friends.

For these reasons, I must confess, it gave me *some* surprise to hear the Author was a Divine of the church of England, but *none* to find he had been long such a favourite with the Dissenters, that, for the great service they thought he did their cause in writing against the form of worship in his own church, in a letter to the Bishop of Durham, they gladly associated with him as a *most worthy, learned,*
and

and excellent champion to shake the Pillars of Priest-craft and Orthodoxy. He appears by his performance to have read a great deal of controversy between the Church of England and the Presbyterians, and to have imbibed too much of the Puritanical Spirit.

He vilifies the church of England at every turn; and all, who defend it against him or its adversaries, he treats with as much rancour as *Prynne* did *Laud*; though he is so much blinded by prejudice, as to fancy himself the essence of candour, as well as the oracle of truth.

It avails nothing to write against him with learning and temper. He will sneer at them both, rank those
who

who oppose him with Papists, and picture them as hypocrites, by insinuating that they support errors to the utmost of their power, when they know them to be such. He abounds with this low and dirty work; and as one mark of his prowess (and to which these pages are chiefly directed) he can bring a most severe charge against the church in general, by attempting to prove, that the Bishops and others of its rulers, *fraudulently* foisted into the 20th Article a clause to support her exorbitant power.

This, if true, is a very heavy charge; but if false, and if he could not but know it to be so, as I think myself able to prove, what must we think of the candour and
sincerity

sincerity of the reforming and renowned author of the *Confessional*?

That he had the most convincing reasons to believe the charge to be false, I am verily persuaded. For he has in the *Confessional* quoted several books which contain undeniable proofs of the authenticity of the contested clause, though he has not taken the least notice of such proofs being either in those books, or in any others; nay, on the contrary, he has the unaccountable assurance to treat it as a fraud too palpable to be denied. But that you may judge of this matter for yourself, I will lay before you, first his charge, and then subjoin those proofs in defence of the clause, which I find in the books he has
quoted

quoted in the Confessional, and to which, I am satisfied, no reasonable reply or objection can be made.

‘ *Hales’s* Tract concerning *Schism*
 ‘ was written in the year 1636, and
 ‘ this (his) apologetical Letter (to
 ‘ Archbishop Laud) very soon after;
 ‘ which I mention on account of a
 ‘ passage in it, that carries with it a
 ‘ very strong presumption, that the
 ‘ first clause in our twentieth Article,
 ‘ concerning *Church-Authority*, was
 ‘ not *at that time* held for authentic.
 ‘ The passage I mean is this. “ I
 “ count in point of *decision* of
 “ *Church questions*, if I say of the
 “ *Authority of the Church*, that it
 “ was *none*; I know no adversary
 “ I have, the church of Rome only
 “ excepted. For this cannot be
 “ true,

“ true, except we make the church
 “ *judge of controversies*; the *contra-*
 “ *ry* to which we generally *main-*
 “ *tain* against *that* church.”

‘ Would *Hales* have said this,
 ‘ and said it too to such a man as
 ‘ *Laud*, if he might have been con-
 ‘ fronted with an *authentic* book of
 ‘ Articles? About three years be-
 ‘ fore, *viz.* in 1633, the authenti-
 ‘ city of this first clause of the 20th
 ‘ Article had been publicly debat-
 ‘ ed in the Divinity-schools at Ox-
 ‘ ford, upon occasion of *Peter Hey-*
 ‘ *lin’s* disputing for his Doctor’s
 ‘ degree. *Prideaux*, as the Pro-
 ‘ fessor, read the *Latin* Article out
 ‘ of the *Corpus Confessionum*, publish-
 ‘ ed at *Geneva*, 1612, without the
 ‘ clause. *Heylin* objected to this
 B ‘ authority

‘ authority, sent a Friend (one
 ‘ *Westley*) to a neighbouring book-
 ‘ seller’s, who furnished him with
 ‘ an *English* copy of the Articles,
 ‘ *with* the disputed clause, which
 ‘ he read aloud, and then delivered
 ‘ to the by-standers to satisfy them-
 ‘ selves. This, it seems, had the
 ‘ desired effect: but, as the au-
 ‘ thor of the *Historical and Critical*
 ‘ *Essay on the thirty-nine Articles*
 ‘ *observes*, with very little reason:
 “ For,” saith he, the *English* edi-
 “ tion produced, which was, in
 “ all probability, the late edition
 “ set forth with the King’s Decla-
 “ ration, seems very improper to
 “ determine the controversy by,
 “ when the question related to the
 “ *Latin* Articles. If any *Latin*
 “ copy

“ copy of the Articles, printed by
 “ authority, had been brought in-
 “ to the schools, the auditory must
 “ have been *satisfied* of the contra-
 “ ry, if they had judged of the au-
 “ thority of the clause by a printed
 “ copy of the Articles.” Introd.
 p. 28.

‘ Upon this fact, I shall take
 ‘ the liberty to make a few remarks.
 ‘ 1. There is no evidence of this
 ‘ victory but *Heylin’s* own. *Exa-*
 ‘ *men Historicum*, 1st Appendix,
 ‘ p. 217, unless you will believe
 ‘ the compiler of *Heylin’s* article in
 ‘ the *Biographia Britannica*, who
 ‘ hath added to the original histo-
 ‘ rian’s account, that “ *by this ocu-*
 “ *lar demonstration, Prideaux, as*
 “ *well as his partizans, was silenced.*”

‘ It appears, by the sequel, relat-
 ‘ ed by *Heylin* himself, that *Prideaux*
 ‘ and his *partizans* were *not* silenc-
 ‘ ed, but remained convinced *after*,
 ‘ as well as *before*, this event, that
 ‘ the clause was spurious. 2. As
 ‘ *Heylin* read the clause in *Latin*,
 ‘ he was bound to verify it by an
 ‘ authentic *Latin* copy. This he
 ‘ knew he could not do, and there-
 ‘ fore gave the cue to *Westly*, to
 ‘ bring him such a copy as would
 ‘ serve the turn; and *Westly* would
 ‘ have been highly to blame to
 ‘ bring him a copy *without* the
 ‘ clause, if there was a copy *of any*
 ‘ sort to be had *with* the clause.

‘ 3. *Heylin* himself tells us, that
 ‘ the very next year, *viz.* 1634.
 ‘ *Latin* copies of the Articles were
 ‘ printed

' printed at *Oxford*, without the
 ' clause, as supposed by encourage-
 ' ment of *Prideaux* (so far was *Pri-*
 ' *deaux* or his partizans from being
 ' either *satisfied* or *silenced* by *Heylin's*
 ' *English copy*). For this *Heylin*
 ' tells us, *Prideaux* received a check
 ' from *Laud*, then Chancellor of
 ' the University; " So continues
 ' *Heylin*, the printers were con-
 ' strained to re-print the book, or
 ' that part of it at least, according
 ' to the genuine and ancient copies"
 ' *Ibib.* p. 218. Mr. *Collins* calls
 ' this a *forgery*, and surely not with-
 ' out reason, if, before that *con-*
 ' *straint*, there were no *Latin* copies
 ' which had the clause. But all
 ' this management on the side of
 ' the clause would not do. The *Latin*

‘ Articles were still printed *without*
 ‘ the clause. And I have now be-
 ‘ fore me a *Latin* edition of the
 ‘ Articles without the clause, prin-
 ‘ ted at *Oxford*, by *Leonard Litch-*
 ‘ *field*, printer to the University,
 ‘ in the year 1636. And this
 ‘ brings us down to the date of
 ‘ *Hales’s* Letter to *Laud*, the ex-
 ‘ pression in which Letter is equal
 ‘ to a thousand witnesses, that the
 ‘ first clause of the twentieth Arti-
 ‘ cle, as it now stands in our pre-
 ‘ sent editions, was not held, by
 ‘ the most learned and judicious
 ‘ Divines of those days, to be of
 ‘ the least authority, whether it was
 ‘ found in *Latin* or *English* copies.”
 ‘ Confess. p. 367. 3d Edit.

You

You see in the above quotation, the author of the Confessional is very positive, that the clause in the beginning of our 20th Article is a *forgery*; and also that the extract from *Hales's* letter is with him equal to a thousand witnesses, that the contested clause, as it now stands in our present editions, was not held by the most learned and judicious Divines of those days to be of the least authority, whether found in *Latin* or *English* copies.

This is roundly asserted, and if true, a heavy load of guilt will deservedly fall on the authors and supporters of this forgery. As one way, however, to make it good, you'll observe the *bonest* author of the Confessional has not brought

any thing worth the least notice, in behalf of the *authenticity* of this contested clause; yet, from his great reading in our church History, and talent for controversy, no one can suppose him ignorant of what has been said for it, (if there ever was any thing said for it) by the friends of our religious establishment. And as a *member*, nay a *Minister* of the Church, who could have imagined him inclinable to *suppress* what he knew would take off, or mitigate this charge of forgery brought against the church he serves and lives in. Yet he has not only been guilty of this illaudable partiality, but in opposition to evidence, which could not but satisfy himself (as it
hitherto

hitherto has done all other capable men) he has given the calumny a new dress, and endeavoured to impose it upon his readers, as a fact equally true and important.

Now my dear friend, should it be found, that this contested clause was in the original record of the 39 Articles, and immediately printed in *Latin*, and in *English*, as we now have it, and that several years after, an edition in *Latin* and *English* was surreptitiously printed by the supposed management of the Puritans, without the clause, notwithstanding the Articles were still printed by authority with the clause; I say, if all this was well known to the author of the *Confessional*, what can be said for his honesty?

Whenever

Whenever this writer has to deal with a *defender* of the Church of England, he can be as dextrous as possible in taking off the force of his arguments; but you see, if the Church is to be loaded with the worst of crimes, he will even step out of his way to tell the dismal tale. So dutiful a son is he to mother-church, and so well is he qualified for reformation, by sincerity and candour?

Before I give you the positive proofs of the genuineness of this disputed clause, I'll tell you what the author of the Confessional might have said, had he been so disposed, provided he had been ignorant of the many authentic editions there are of the Articles wherein it is found.

found. He might have urged, that the part of the 20th Article here disputed, (*viz.* that *the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith;*) is very agreeable to the *power* of the Church of England, and every other church, and that in all ages it has been claimed and exercised, and hence it is no wonder if it be found *expressed* in her Articles.

If the Church believed she had *no* authority in controversies of Faith; how came she to draw up and impose subscription to *any* Articles of faith at all? If she claim *no* power to decree rights and ceremonies, how came she to draw up and impose the *Canons*, and

Rubricks

Rubricks in the *Liturgy*? If the church had *no* power and authority, why did the *convocations* meet and exercise such power? Could not the church of England declare against the *Infallibility* of the church without quitting all *power* and *authority*? Can there be no *power* without *Infallibility*? If so, how came we by our courts of civil Power? The author of the Confessional, could have said many such things in defence either of this clause, or of whatsoever else he wished to find true. But his heart was not this way inclined.

You see he appears to lay the whole stress of his proof of this forgery, on a surmise, that *Hales* could never have wrote in the manner

ner he did to *Bishop Laud*, if it had been authentic. But if after *Hales* wrote that letter to Bp. *Laud*, his Lordship had it in his power to confront him, and actually did confront him, with an authentic book of Articles, (nay the very original Record) then it must be manifest the confessionalist's blind surmise falls to the ground; and, what is much worse for him, it must bring down his honesty along with it; as his surmise was founded on what he knew to be false.

But suppose *Hales* had been ignorant of the contested clause in the 20th Article of our Church, when he said, *the authority of the church was none*, might not *Laud* have taught him better? The
learned

learned author of the *confessional* knows it to be more than probable he did tell him of his mistake.*

He knows also, that *Heylin* wrote the life of A. Bp. *Laud*, in which book may be found this passage under the year 1638.

“ There past also up and down a Discourse of *Schism* not printed, but transmitted from hand to hand in written Copies, intended chiefly for the encouragement of some of our great Masters of Wit and Reason, to despise the Authority of the Church, † which being dispersed about this time (1638) gave the Archbishop occasion to send for him (*Hales*) to *Lambeth*, in hopes

* See P. S. the first at the end.

† Said to be for *Chillingworth's* use.

hopes that he might gain the man, whose abilities he was well acquainted with, when he lived in Oxon. An excellent *Grecian* in those days, and one whom *Savil* made great use of, in his *Greek* Edition of *St. Chrysostom's* Works. About nine of the Clock in the Morning he came to know his Grace's pleasure, who took him along with him into his Garden, commanding that none of his Servants should come to him upon any occasion. There they continued in discourse till the Bell rang to Prayers, and after Prayers were ended, till Dinner was ready, and after that too, till the coming in of the Lord *Conway*, and some other Persons of honour, put a necessity

cessity upon some of his Servants to give him notice how the time had passed away. So in they came, high-coloured, and almost panting for want of breath; enough to shew that there had been some heats between them, not then fully cooled. It was my chance to be there that day, either to know his Grace's pleasure, or to render an account of some former commands, but I know not which; and I found *Hales* very glad to see me in that place, as being himself a meer stranger to it, and unknown to all. He told me afterwards, that he found the Archbishop (whom he knew before for a nimble Disputant) to be as well versed in books as business; That he had
 been

been ferretted by him from one hole to another, till there was none left to afford him any further shelter; That he was now resolved to be Orthodox, and to declare himself a true Son of the *Church of England*, both for Doctrine and Discipline; That to this end he had obtained leave to call himself his *Grace's* Chaplain, that naming him in his public Prayers for his Lord and Patron, the greater notice might be taken of the alteration. Thus was *Hares* gained unto the Church, and gained a good preferment in it; promoted not long after by the Archbishop's Commendation to be Prebend of *Windsor*, and to hold the same by

C

special

special dispensation, with his place in *Eaton*."

Heylin's Cyprianus, p. 362.

This the *impartial* author of the confessional ought to have told us, which would have been a sufficient answer to his uncharitable surmise.

But I shall convince you that this *just* man has read many positive proofs for the authenticity of this contested clause, notwithstanding he does not chuse to mention them. To begin with his *favourite Laud*, whose life, and history of his times he seems to have long made his study.

Arch-

Archbishop *Laud* in his speech delivered in the Star-chamber June 14, 1637, at the censure of *Bastwick*, *Burton*, and *Prynn*, defends himself as follows —

“ The *fourteenth* and the *last* *Innovation* comes with a *mighty Charge*, and 'tis taken out of an *Epistle* to the *Temporal Lords* of His Majesty's *Privy Council*. Of which *Epistle* we got one sheet, and so (for ought I yet know) that *Impression* staid: In that sheet is this *Charge*; the words are, *The Prelates, to justifie their Proceedings, have forged a new Article of Religion, brought from ROME (which gives them full power to alter the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church at a Blow (as they interpret it) and*

have foisted (such is their Language) into the beginning of the 20th Article of our Church, And this is in the last Edition of our Articles, Anno 1628, in affront of his Majesty's Declaration, before them, &c.

The Clause (which they say is *forged* by us) is this, *The Church* (that is, the *Bishops*, as they expound it) *hath Power to Decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in matters of Faith.* (The words are *Controversies of Faith*, by their leave.) *This Clause* (say they) *is a forgery fit to be Examined, and deeply Censured in the Star-Chamber. For 'tis not to be found in the Latin or English Articles of Edward VI. or Queen Elizabeth, ratified by Parlia-*

Parliament. And then in the *Mar-*
gen thus. *If to forge a Will or*
Writing be censurable in the Star-
Chamber, which is but a wrong to
a private Man; how much more the
Forgery of an Article of Religion,
to wrong the whole Church, and
overturn Religion, which concerns
all our Souls?

“ This is a *heavy Charge, my*
Lords; but I thank God the An-
swer is easy. And truly I grant,
that to Forge an Article of Religion
in whole or in part, and then to
thrust it upon the Church, is a
most beinous Crime, far worse than
the Forging of a Deed. And is
certainly very deeply Censurable in
this Court. And I would have
humbly besought you, that a deep

Censure might have been laid upon it, but that this *sheet* was found after, and so is not annexed to the *Information*, nor in *Judgment* at this present before you. But then, *my Lords*, I must tell you, I hope to make it as *clear* as the *Day*, that this *Forgery* was not, *that* this *Clause* mentioned was added by the *Prelates* to the *Article*, to gain *Power* to the *Church*, and so serve *our turns*; But that, that this *Clause* in the beginning of the *Article* was by these Men, or at the least by some of their *Faction*, *raised out*, and this to weaken the just *Power* of the *Church* to serve *their turns*.

“ They say, (to justify their *Charge*) that this *Clause* is not to
be

be found in the *Articles, English* or *Latin* of either *Edward VI.* or *Queen Elizabeth.* I answer: The *Articles* of *Edward VI.* and those made under *Queen Elizabeth* differ very much. And those of *Edward VI.* are not now binding. So whether the *Clause* be *In* or *Out* of *them,* 'tis not much *material.*

But for the *Articles* of the *Church* of *England,* made in the *Queen's* time, and now in *force,* that this *Clause* for the Power of the *Church* to *Decree Ceremonies,* and to have *Authcrity* in *Controversies* of *Faith,* should not be found in *English* or *Latin Copies* till the *Year 1628.* that it was set forth with the *King's Declaration* before it, is to me a *Miracle;* but your *Lordships* shall

see the *Falshood* and *Boldness* of these Men. *What?* Is this *Affirmative Clause* in no *Copy*, *English* or *Latin* till the Year 1628? *Strange*: Why, my *Lords*, I have a *Copy* of the *Articles* in *English* of the Year 1612, and of the Year 1605, and of the Year 1593, and in *Latin* of the Year 1563, which was one of the *first Printed Copies*, if not the *first of all*. For the *Articles* were agreed on but the *nine and twentieth Day of January* Anno 156 $\frac{2}{3}$. And in all these, this *Affirmative Clause* for the Church's Power is in. And is not this strange *boldness* then to *abuse* the World, and falsely to say 'tis in no *Copy* when I *myself*, out of my own *store* am able to shew

shew it in so *many*, and so *anciently*.

“ But my *Lords*, I shall make it plainer yet : For 'tis not fit concerning an *Article* of *Religion*, and an *Article* of such *Consequence* for the *Order*, *Truth*, and *Peace* of this *Church*, you should *rely* upon my *Copies*, be they never so *many* or never so *ancient*. Therefore I sent to the *Public Records* in my *Office*, and here under my *Officer's* *Hand*, who is a *Public Notary*, has returned me the *Twentieth Article* with this *Affirmative Clause* in it. And there is also the whole *Body* of the *Articles* to be seen.

“ By this your *Lordships* see, how free the *Prelates* are from *forging* this part of the *Article*.

Now

Now let these Men quit themselves and their *Faction*, as they can, for their *Index Expurgatorius*, and their foul *Rasure*, in leaving out this *part* of the *Article*. For to leave out of an *Article* is as great a *Crime* as to put in; And a *Main Rasure* is as *Censurable* in this Court as a *Forgery*.

Why, But then my *Lords*; what is this *Mystery of Iniquity*? Truly, I cannot certainly tell, but as far as I can I'll tell you.

The *Articles* you see were *fully*, and *fairly* agreed to, and *subscribed* in the *Year* 156 $\frac{2}{3}$. But after this, in the *Year* 1571, there were some that *refused to subscribe*, but why they did so, is not *recorded*. Whether it were about this *Article*

or

or any other I know not. But in Fact this is Manifest, that in the Year 1571, The *Articles* were Printed both in *Latin* and *English*, and this *Clause* for the *Church* left out of both. And certainly this could not be done, but by the malicious *cunning* of that *Opposite Faction*. And though I shall spare *dead Men's Names* where I have not *certainty*; yet if you be *pleased* to *look back* and *consider* who they were that *Governed* busineses in 1571, and *rid* the Church almost at their *pleasure*; and how potent the *Ancestors* of these *Libellers* began *then* to grow, you will think it no *hard* matter to have the *Articles Printed*, and *this Clause left out*.

“ And

“ And yet 'tis plain, That, after the stir about Subscription in the Year 1571, the *Articles* were settled and subscribed unto at last, as in the Year 1562, with this *Clause* in them for the Church; For looking farther into the *Records* which are in mine own Hands, I have found the *Book* of 156 $\frac{2}{3}$, subscribed by *all the Lower House of Convocation*, in this very Year of Contradiction, 1571, Dr. John Aylmer, who was after Lord Bishop of London) being their *Prolocutor*: Alexander Nowel, Dean of St. Pauls, having been *Prolocutor* in 156 $\frac{2}{3}$, and yet living, and present and subscribing in 1571. Therefore, I do here openly in the *Star-Chamber* Charge upon that pure Set this foul Corruption of falsifying

sifying the Articles of the Church of England; let them take it off as they can."

H. Wharton's 2d Vol. of the Remains of Bp. Laud, p. 82.

[N. B. The Bishop printed this speech the year he delivered it 1637, but I never heard that any reply was made, or any attempt to clear the *pure Set* from the Bishop's charge.]

The substance of the Archbishop's speech is in *Heylin's* life of him, a book quoted by the author of the confessional, p. 25. and he has made use of great part of the speech in his preface to the second Edition, p. 9. Therefore I may venture

venture to affirm this *defence* of the *contested Clause* was known to him.

Now I ask this honest *Son* of the *Church of England*, why he took no notice of it? Was it too weak to support the Clause? No; it was always held by the best judges as it really is, to be unanswerable. It gave such satisfaction, that even the Dissenters at the Savoy Conference never doubted the truth of it. Then why did not the Author of the Confessional attempt to invalidate the force of *Laud's* defence, before he so positively pronounced it justly suspected of Forgery? And if he could not answer the Archbishop's proofs, why did he say the clause was not held for authentic at that time, nor esteemed

to

to be of the least authority by the most learned and judicious Divines of those Days?

This *unfair* management of matters in *suppressing evidence* lies open to very severe animadversion as you will find our author himself acknowledging at the close of this long letter.——

But to proceed.——The author of the Confessional tells us, as good proof against the Clause, that there were the *Latin* Articles Printed at *Geneva*, without the Clause, in the Year 1612. Was ever any thing so weak? so trifling? Did the governors of our Church keep a Printing Press at *Geneva*? Or were there no printed Copies of the Articles before 1612, though they
were

were agreed upon and subscribed in the year 1562? strange indeed! Why, he knows that *Laud* had a Copy printed in 1563, supposed to be the first that was taken off; another in 1593, another 1605, and another in the year 1612. But what puts it beyond all dispute, is the original Record. Must it not be miserable trifling in this author, after so many old Editions with the Clause, to see him vaunt of his own Edition without it; when printed? O! fie——in the year 1636, only one year before *Laud's* speech, and above seventy years after the first Edition.

Mr. Selden, a man in great repute when *Laud* defended the contested *Clause*, it is said was employed

to

to look what proofs there were for it. The author of the *Confessional* acknowledges that ‘ Mr. *Selden indeed was no friend to Church-Secrets*, therefore we will now look at his testimony, and that too in a book known to the author of the *Confessional*, (see p. 12. pref. 2d Ed.)

“ There is a Question about that Article concerning the Power of the Church, whether these Words (of having Power in Controversies of Faith) were not stolen in, but ’tis most certain they were in the Book of Articles that was *confirmed* though in some Editions they were left out.”

Table Talk p. 22.

Could a candid Historian, that had this opinion of so great a judge

D

of

of the evidence of the authenticity of the Clause, say, that the Clause was not held in Selden's days, to be of the least authority, whether found in *Latin* or *English* copies?

No man had better opportunities to know whether it was authentic or not, than Selden; and I shall soon give you my reasons for saying so, (see p. 50.)

I cannot forbear observing by the way, that Selden says it was in the book of Articles that was *confirmed*—but that *it was afterwards left out in some Editions.*—Left out; by whom? Had it been left out by the Bishops' craft, the Author of the Confessional could not have been silent. But its coming so full in the face of his *Pure* forefathers,

fathers, even by *Selden's* own confession, is too cutting. It must not be so much as hinted, that it ever entered into the heart of man, that the *Puritans put it out*; but on the contrary roundly asserted, that it was held for no authority, and therefore, a forgery to *put it in*.

There is another Witness for the authenticity of this Clause, well known to the author of the *Confessional*: He calls him *honest old Rogers*. * This *Rogers* was the first

D 2

who

* As our Author has much to say in favour of *Rogers's* book on the 39 Articles, it may be worth your notice to hear a little of it; and more you may see in p. 234.

'*Rogers* has greatly the advantage of all that come after him, in point of *authority*. His book was dedicated to Archbishop *Bancroft*, whose chaplain he was; and bears in the front of it a testimony, that it was *perused by lawful authority of the church of England, allowed to be printed.*'

who wrote upon the 39 Articles. The first edition of his book is said to have come out in the year 1579. It has a preface or is dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury 1607. In the Preface *Rogers* gives this testimony.

‘ Last of all, His *Majesty* calleth
 ‘ for *Subscription* unto *Articles* of
 ‘ *Religion*, but they are not either
 ‘ *Articles* of his own, lately devis-
 ‘ ed, or the old newly furbished
 ‘ up; but the very *Articles* agreed
 ‘ upon by the *Archbishops*, and
 ‘ *Bishops* of both *Provinces*, and the
 ‘ whole *Clergy* in the *Convocation*
 ‘ holden at London and that in the
 ‘ year of our Lord God 1561, and
 ‘ unto none other; even the same
 ‘ *Articles*, for number Thirty-nine,
 ‘ no

‘no more, no fewer; and for
‘words, syllables, and letters, the
‘very same, unaugmented, undi-
‘minished, unaltered. No. 28.

This is good Evidence—This is *honest old Rogers*. Had the honest old man been a Prophet, and foreseen the day, that a degenerate Son should arise in the Church, and attempt to prove a forgery in one of the *Articles*, he could not possibly have worded his Evidence stronger.

Tell me, is it possible (to use the words of the Author of the Confessional) that this *honest old Rogers* should say this to *such a man as Bancroft*, Archbishop of Canterbury, if he could have been confuted by any authentic book of Articles? Nay is it possible that

he should so emphatically word it, and give the Article with the contested Clause just as we this day have it, and no one of that *Pure Sect* be honest enough to expose him?—Was there no *Cartwright*, no *Martin Mar Prelate* then alive, to make it the subject of a slanderous *Cofessional*? Shall such a notable book, even the first *commentary* on the *Articles* come out, in the very heat of contention between the Church and Puritans (a book that provoked them to speak out, as it warmly condemns them) and shall this book, I say, keep its reputation for so many years, if the contested clause was not then held for genuine? Impossible!

If

If Rogers had known it had ever been *contested*, how happens it, that he takes no notice of so extraordinary a fact, and makes no attempts to defend it?

Can the subtle *Confessionalist*, account for this? Dr. Bennet also wrote an Essay on the 39 Articles, (often mentioned in the *Confessional*) in which the contested clause of the 20th Article is demonstrated to be genuine. There is a *Prefatory Epistle* to *Anthony Collins*, Esq; wherein the egregious Falshoods and Calumnies of the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection* are exposed. The Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection* did not put his name to his scandalous Libel; but was supposed
 ‘ to be so wretched a *low Churchman*,

‘ as to dispute all the Articles of
 ‘ the Christian Faith; to be a per-
 ‘ fect Factor for Atheism itself;
 ‘ and to run up and down vending
 ‘ Objections, that were none of his
 ‘ own, against the very being of
 ‘ God.’

*Vindication of the Church of
 England, p. 132.*

The design of the Author of
Priestcraft in Perfection, was to
 prove the contested Clause in the
 20th Article to be a forgery. The
 Prefatory Epistle by Dr. Bennet to
 A. Collins is so very striking, and
 so applicable to the *Author of the
 Confessional*, that I am persuaded
 his malice against the Church of
 England is as great as ever rankled
 in

in the heart of any *Deist*; otherwise he could not possibly have read that Epistle and Book, and afterwards have entertained the least doubt of the *autherity* of the contested Clause, but on the contrary, have had every reason to charge the enemies of the Church of England with leaving it out.

Mr. Bedford likewise wrote an answer to *Priestcraft in Perfection*, printed in 1710, called A Vindication of the Church of England, &c. But I do not find it mentioned in the Confessional. However as the book is very common, and mentioned by *Strype and Bennet*, I have no doubt but the Author of the Confessional has seen it. Mr. *Collier* also in his Ecclesiastical History,

tory, (a book very well known,) takes a large account from it, in proof of the authority of the disputed Clause.

At the end of the Preface to Mr. Bedford's book, is this Advertisement ' For the farther Satisfaction ' of all Inquirers, there shall be left ' in Mr. *Wilkin's* Hands, three different English Editions of the ' Articles printed by *R. Jugge* and ' *J. Carwood*, in the Year 1571, all ' containing the contested Clause ' in the 20th Article.'

Do you imagine the *Author* of the *Confessional* will combat these with his *Geneva Edition* of 1612, or with that which is now before him of 1636?

Strype's

Strype's life of Archbishop Parker is another common book, and one with which the Author of the *Confessional* is very well acquainted.

I will therefore give you part of what he says in defence of this Clause, from p. 320. ' That first
' Synod of 1562, in all probability
' framed the Twentieth Article
' with that Addition of the Churches
' *Power of decreeing Rites, and Cere-*
' *monies, and Authority, &c.* (it not
' being in Edward the 6th Arti-
' cles) as we have it now; as is
' evident from Two *Latin* Copies
' of the 39 Articles, printed by
' *Reynold Wolf*, 1563, soon after
' the Conclusion of that Synod:
' both which have it. One is still
' extant in the *Bodleian* Library, at
' Oxford

‘ Oxford, among Mr. *Selden’s*
 ‘ Books; with this Remark, that
 ‘ as it was printed it was read over
 ‘ in the Synod of 1571, and allow-
 ‘ ed and confirmed by the Subscrip-
 ‘ tion of above an Hundred Names
 ‘ of the Lower House. And a-
 ‘ mong these, are the Names of
 ‘ *John Elmar*, Archdeacon of *Lin-*
 ‘ *coln*, and Prolocutor; and *Alexan-*
 ‘ *der Nowell*, Dean of *Paul’s*, Pro-
 ‘ locutor in the last Synod. Which
 ‘ original Subscriptions in a long
 ‘ Roll, are tacked to that printed
 ‘ Book, and remain in the same
 ‘ Library; being found in Arch-
 ‘ bishop *Laud’s* Library, from
 ‘ whence Mr. *Selden* immediately
 ‘ had it.

‘ And

‘ And beside the Two former in
 ‘ *Latin*, there were several *English*
 ‘ Editions of this Book of Articles
 ‘ with the Clause, printed by *Jugge*
 ‘ and *Carwood*, in this same year
 ‘ 1571, as was shewn before.

‘ So that at length an Edition
 ‘ that appeared abroad in the same
 ‘ year, printed by *John Day*, wan-
 ‘ ting the Clause, hath been judged
 ‘ (and that upon good Grounds)
 ‘ to be spurious: and the Rasure
 ‘ of the *Churches Power and Autho-*
 ‘ *rity*, to be owing to the Interest
 ‘ and Cunning of a Faction, that
 ‘ then prevailed much, and had not
 ‘ a few Favourers at Court.’

All this Evidence, and very much
 more, for the Authority of this
 Clause, is undoubtedly well known
 to

to the Author of the *Confessional*. It is also impossible to doubt his knowing that it was left out by the Puritans, notwithstanding he takes no notice of it, and in spite of all faith in history, attempts to shift the villainy from the guilty Puritans, and lay it on the innocent church Party. And if such Evidence as I have produced, (though there is much more in the Authors I have taken it from) will not convince him, will he be convinced if Archbishop Parker and the rest of the Convocation who drew up, or new modelled the Articles, were to rise from the dead, and write a volume twice as big as the *Confessional* in support of it?

If

If the *Author* of the *Confessional* be (as some say he is) a Clergy-man, and the *A—d—n* of *C—l—d*, this specimen of his candour and goodwill towards the Church of England, will, I do not doubt, lay open to you such an instance of *Priestcraft in Perfection*, as is not to be Paralleled by any writer against the Church of England in our time, and in saying this, I do not except the *Jesuitism* even of the *Jesuits*.

He is very free in lashing the characters of other Authors, let their works be ever so deserving of praise, on account of the Service they have done the Church of England: For that Service appears to be what stings him. He seems also to have laboured for many years

years to bring into contempt, the Church in which he officiates, and the Church he solemnly promised to support. From this disposition to find fault, we are not to wonder if we find nothing in the *Confessional* in favour of the Doctrine and Discipline of our Church, nor of her most worthy Divines, more than may be found in the most inveterate Dissenters and Deists, who have wrote against her. In short, to me, his book from the Preface, to the concluding Card to Mr. Jones, carries with it the face of a Libel. But I shall trouble you no further at present with my remarks upon him, and only observe to you, that whenever you read his book, never trust him; and if any
ask

ask you for his character (as he has not put his name to it) you will do him no injury, if you give him such a one as he gives to a much honefter man, *Peter Heylin*, whom he calls ‘ the Profligate Firebrand ‘ of the Laudean age, a man loft ‘ to all fenfe of truth and modesty, ‘ whenever the intereft or claims of ‘ the church come in queftion.’

Page 165, 285, 326.



E

POST-

POSTSCRIPT FIRST.

For the better understanding of what *Hales* intended by the words quoted by the Author of the Confessional, (see p. 6.) I shall here add what follows.

HALES in his Tract concerning Schism and Schismatics. endeavours to make ‘ *Herefy* and ‘ *Schism*, as they are in common ‘ use (to be no more than) two ‘ Theological *Scare Crows*, with ‘ which they who uphold a Party in

‘in Religion use to fright away
 ‘such, as making inquiry into it,
 ‘are ready to relinquish and op-
 ‘pose, if it appear either erroneous
 ‘or suspicious.

He tells you ‘the first notable
 ‘*Schism* we read of in the Church,
 ‘was about, what time we should
 ‘begin to keep Easter.——This
 ‘matter, (he says) tho’ most un-
 ‘necessary, most vain, yet caused
 ‘as great a Combustion as ever
 ‘was in the Church; the *West* se-
 ‘parating and refusing Communion
 ‘with the *East* for many years to-
 ‘gether. In this fantastical Hur-
 ‘ry, I cannot see but all the World
 ‘were Schismatics; neither can
 ‘any thing excuse them from that
 ‘Imputation, excepting only this,
 E 2 ‘that

‘ that we charitably suppose that
 ‘ all parties out of Conscience did
 ‘ what they did. A thing which
 ‘ befel them thro’ the Ignorance of
 ‘ their Guides, (for I will not say
 ‘ their Malice) and that thro’ the
 ‘ just Judgment of God, because
 ‘ thro’ Sloth and blind Obedience
 ‘ Men examined not the things
 ‘ which they were taught, but like
 ‘ Beasts of Burden patiently couch’d
 ‘ down, and indifferently under-
 ‘ went whatsoever their Superiors
 ‘ laid upon them. By the way,
 ‘ by this you may plainly see the
 ‘ Danger of our Appeal unto An-
 ‘ tiquity, for Resolution in contro-
 ‘ verted Points of Faith, and how
 ‘ small Relief we are to expect from
 ‘ thence: For if the Discretion of
 the

‘ the chiefest Guides and Directors
 ‘ of the Church, did in a Point so
 ‘ trivial, so inconsiderable, so main-
 ‘ ly fail them, as not to see the
 ‘ Truth in a Subject, wherein it is
 ‘ the greatest marvel how they could
 ‘ avoid the Sight of it; Can we,
 ‘ without imputation of extreme
 ‘ Grossness and Folly, think so poor
 ‘ spirited Persons competent Judges
 ‘ of the Questions now on foot be-
 ‘ twixt the Churches? Pardon me,
 ‘ I know not what Temptation drew
 ‘ that Note from me.

You see the Principal design
Hales had here in view, was to de-
 prive the Ancient Fathers of the
 Church, of that *Authority* they had
 in the *Church of Rome*, as well as
 with some others. He tells you

E 3

how

how miserably they blundered, in a very plain matter of fact, wherein he was surpris'd that any one could mistake. He tells you the ancient Fathers would brand their adversaries with the odious names of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* upon very unjust grounds; therefore, there was no need of appealing to them to determine our Controversies of Faith, since their Authority was so little worth.

Nevertheless it appears very evident to me, from reading *Hales's* Tract on *Schism*, and his Letter to *Laud* which it occasioned, that *Hales* had not the least intention in either tract to dispute the Ancient or any National Church the Power of *Decreeing Rites or Ceremonies*, or
 having

having *authority in Controversies of Faith*. *Hales* knew his own, and every Church always claimed and exercised such Power. And in the very page, from which the author of the Confessional brings his quotation to brand his Church with foisting in this contested Clause, *Hales* expresses himself in these words:

‘Whereas in one point, speaking
 ‘of church authority, I bluntly
 ‘added, (which is none;) I must
 ‘acknowledge it was uncautiously
 ‘spoken; and being taken in the
 ‘*generality* is false; tho’ as it refers
 ‘to the *occasion* which there I fall
 ‘upon, ’tis (as I think may safely
 ‘say) *most true*. For *Church-authority*, that is, authority residing in

‘ ecclesiastical persons, is either of
 ‘ *jurisdiction* in *Church causes*, and
 ‘ *matter of fact*; or of *decision*, in
 ‘ point of *church questions*, and *dis-*
 ‘ *putable* opinions. As for the
 ‘ *first*; in *church causes* or *matter*
 ‘ *of fact*, ecclesiastical persons in
 ‘ cases of their cognizance have the
 ‘ *same authority* as any others have,
 ‘ to whom power of jurisdiction is
 ‘ committed. Their *consistories*,
 ‘ their *courts*, their *determinations*,
 ‘ stand upon as warrantable evi-
 ‘ dence, as the decisions of *other*
 ‘ *benches and courts* do.——

Then immediately follows——

‘ I count in point of *decision* of
 ‘ *church questions*, if I say of the
 ‘ *authority of the church*, that it was
 ‘ *none*; I know no *adversary* that I
 ‘ have,

' have, the *church of Rome* only
 ' excepted. For this *cannot be true*,
 ' except we make the church judge
 ' of *controversies*; the *contrary* to
 ' which, we generally *maintain* a-
 ' gainst that church. Now it plain-
 ' ly appears, that upon this occa-
 ' sion I speak it; For, beginning
 ' to speak of *Schism* arising by rea-
 ' son of ambiguous opinions, I
 ' brought in nakedly those words
 ' which gave occasion of *offence*;
 ' which if I had spoken with due
 ' qualification, I had not erred at
 ' all.

After a few lines he adds.
 ' Whether dominion *in Civilibus*,
 ' or *in Sacris* be ut 1615 &c. or comes
 ' in by *divine right*, it concerns
 ' *them* to look to, who have domi-
 ' nion

' nion committed to them. To
 ' *others*, whose duty it is to obey,
 ' (and to *myself* above all, who am
 ' best contented to live and die a
 ' poor and private man,) it is a
 ' speculation merely useless. Our
 ' Saviour questions not *Herod's* or
 ' *Augustus's* title; and confessed
 ' that *Pilate* had his power *from*
 ' *above*; which yet we know came
 ' but by *delegation* from *Tiberius*
 ' *Cæsar*. Let titles of honour and
 ' dominion, go as the providence
 ' of God will have; yet quiet and
 ' peaceable men will not fail of obe-
 ' dience. No more will I, or
 ' ought: so be *God* and *good con-*
 ' *science* command not the contrary.
 ' A higher degree of duty, I do
 ' not

‘ not see how any man can demand
 ‘ at my hands.

Thus much of *Hales's* studied sentiments of the matter, when put to his purgation. The author of the Confessional says, ‘ *Laud*, offended at the freedoms *Hales* had taken with church-authority and tradition, in his tract concerning ‘ *Schism*, put the honest man to his purgation, which he underwent with a degree of courage, decency, and good sense, that would have done him honour, had he left nothing behind him but that single letter to *Laud*, p. 367.

It may be so. And if you take into the account what passed between *Hales* and *Laud* after *Hales* had wrote his letter to him ; if you consider

consider how much *Hales* suffered afterwards from the enemies of the Church, and how true a Son he was found in the day of trial, you cannot forbear thinking the author of the Confessional must have a rooted aversion to the power of his Church, before he could prevail with himself to urge such flimsy and inconclusive arguments against it.



SECOND

SECOND POSTSCRIPT.

AFTER I had made the above remarks on the Confessional, I procured Dr. Ridley's Three Letters in answer to it. From the third letter, I find the author of the Confessional had been fully informed of his mistake, with regard to the first part of the 20th Article, and his alledgements against its authenticity as fully refuted, And I must own the bad opinion I had of the honesty of this gleaner and
disperfer

disperfer of church calumny, was greatly confirmed by reading thefe letters; which in my opinion are a full and fufficient answer to every thing worth notice in his book; and fuch a one as fhould make him heartily afhamed of laying before the world [the malignant and uncharitable effufions which occafioned it.

Thefe letters were published in 1768, and by them I find the Confefional had then gone through two editions. However, notwithstanding the authenticity of the firft part of the 20th Article is fully proved in the above-named letter, p. 122, &c. the fame scandalous charge is ftill kept up in a third edition, published in 1770, without

without the least intimation to the reader, that its account of the matter had been controverted. He knew however of these letters, and mentions them in the note, p. 4. Nay it is believed he has wrote against some parts of them, Nevertheless, he still publishes the accusation, though it is too gross for any author surely to maintain, except the author of the Confessional.

In p. 123, of the said third letter, the author says, ‘ Mr. Hales, ‘ in this treatise of schism, printed ‘ about 1636, speaking of church ‘ authority, saith *it is none*. And ‘ being blamed for this and other ‘ things in that treatise, he blames ‘ himself in a letter to Archbishop ‘ Laud

‘ Laud for saying in such general
 ‘ terms that it was *none*; but adds,
 ‘ that, *if in point of decisions of*
 ‘ *church questions he said it was none,*
 ‘ *he knew no adversary that he had,*
 ‘ *the church of Rome only excepted.*
 ‘ On this you ask, *Could Hales have*
 ‘ *said this, and to such a man as*
 ‘ *Laud, if he might have been con-*
 ‘ *fronted with an authentic book of*
 ‘ *articles?* Confess. p. 229. Note.

‘ But whether a man, so immerfed
 ‘ in deeper studies, was acquainted
 ‘ with the different editions of the
 ‘ articles or not, he certainly might
 ‘ have been confronted by an au-
 ‘ thentic book of articles, which had
 ‘ the clause; Wolf’s Latin edition
 ‘ of them printed by the Queen’s
 ‘ authority, in 1563, immediately
 ‘ after

after they had passed in convocation. He might have known also, that the clause was in *many* of the printed books of the articles *then* in use: for there were several editions of the English articles, with the clause, printed within little more than forty years before the tract on schism was written, as in 1593, 1605, 1612, 1628, and many before.

So that you may see, or if you will not, your reader may, how small a matter stands for *almost a demonstration*, or, as you have softened it in your second edition, *a very strong presumption*, with you, when you please. Another, at most, would only have concluded, that Hales had

F

not

‘ not seen a copy, in which the
 ‘ clause about the church’s au-
 ‘ thority was in the 20th article ; or
 ‘ did not believe such article to be
 ‘ a true one. But it might, notwith-
 ‘ standing, be held for authentic
 ‘ by the generality ; and to say,
 ‘ that probably the clause was not
 ‘ in any of the printed books then
 ‘ in use (in 1636) is the wildest
 ‘ extravagance of scepticism.

The letter writer proceeds for
 several pages to defend the dis-
 puted part of the article ; and has
 defended it so well, that the au-
 thor of the Confessional has found
 it much easier to reprint the fal-
 sity, than to say any thing against
 the refutation.

But

But that I may throw a little more light on his character as a *fair writer*, I will satisfy you from his own pen, that he is not ignorant of several of the good qualities which an author ought to possess, and that he also can after all this detection, prevail upon his modesty, to suffer himself to lay a public claim to them. He says —

‘ I have not willingly and knowingly misrepresented any thing, in stating the several cases that have come under consideration. I have cited authorities fairly and candidly, and have not, to my knowledge, suppressed any thing that might shew them to advantage. But if any one should think there is a partial bias in

F 2

‘ the

‘ the reflexions I have occasionally
 ‘ made upon particular passages, I
 ‘ will readily give them up, upon
 ‘ competent proof of such obli-
 ‘ quity, and abide by the conclu-
 ‘ sions which any man of common
 ‘ honesty and common sense shall
 ‘ think fit to draw from this per-
 ‘ plexity of writers, who, on o-
 ‘ ther occasions, acquit themselves
 ‘ with sufficient clearness and con-
 ‘ sistency.

Confess. p. 234.

Fairly and boldly put, it must
 be owned; but are you not a-
 stonished at its effrontery? For the
 author to say this in his third
 edition of the Confessional, after
 being so shamefully detected in
 false

false *colouring*, is certainly worse than *Canting*. But without using *comparisons* to say what the author is, let us do it *positively* at once, and assert him to be, as before,
*'A man lost to all sense both of truth
 'and modesty, whenever the interest
 'or claims of the church come in
 'question.*

F I N I S.



